

James Madison University JMU Scholarly Commons

Libraries

Libraries & Educational Technologies

2018

LCSH in the Southern Levant

Steven W. Holloway

James Madison University, hollowsw@jmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/letfspubs>



Part of the [International Law Commons](#), [Islamic World and Near East History Commons](#), [Legislation Commons](#), [Library and Information Science Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Holloway, Steven W., "LCSH in the Southern Levant" (2018). *Libraries*. 134.
<http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/letfspubs/134>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries & Educational Technologies at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Libraries by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Sanford Berman, LCSH and the Southern Levant

A plethora of conference presentations, publications and webinars have recently appeared that deal with bias in library cataloging, some of which, like the Canadian Federation of Library Associations' response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, are backed up by systematic metadata revisions designed to eliminate the offending terms.³ This movement within

¹ The opinions expressed in this study are solely those of the author and may not align with those of James Madison University or the Commonwealth of Virginia.

² This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in 56/8 (2018),

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/01639374.2018.1508107>.

³ For example, Melissa Adler, "PARAPHILIAS: The Perversion of Meaning in the Library of Congress Subject Headings," *22nd ASIS SIG/CR Classification Research Workshop, 2011*, 1-20, <https://doi.org/10.7152/acro.v22i1.12517>; Christine Bone, "Modifications to the Library of Congress Subject Headings for use by Manitoba archives," *IFLA WLIC 2016 – Columbus, OH – Connections. Collaboration. Community in Session 151 - Classification and Indexing*, <http://library.ifla.org/1328/1/151-bone-en.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2017); Christine Bone, Brett Loughheed, Camille Callison, Janet La France, Terry Reilly, "Changes to Library of Congress Subject Headings Related to Indigenous Peoples: for use in the AMA MAIN Database," MSpace Home, Research Publications from University of Manitoba Researchers, <https://mspace.lib.umanitoba.ca/handle/1993/31177>, with download links to 2015 and 2017

the library science community to challenge gender, racial, class, religious stereotyping in library metadata is labeled by some “decolonization” a corrective to the persistence of the hegemonic

metadata modifications in spreadsheet format (accessed November 16, 2017); Emily Drabinsky, “Teaching the Radical Catalog,” in K. R. Roberto (ed.), *Radical Cataloging: Essays at the Front* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008), [http://courseweb.ischool.illinois.edu/~katewill/spring2014-502/background reading/Drabinski--radical catalog.pdf](http://courseweb.ischool.illinois.edu/~katewill/spring2014-502/background%20reading/Drabinski--radical%20catalog.pdf) (accessed November 16, 2017); Stephen A. Knowlton, “Three Decades Since *Prejudices and Antipathies*: A Study of Changes in the Library of Congress Subject Headings,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (2005): 123-45, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v40n02_08; Brett Loughheed, Ry Moran and Camille Callison, “Reconciliation through Description: Using Metadata to Realize the Vision of the National Research Centre for Truth and Reconciliation,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos. 5-6 (2015): 596-614, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1008718>; Kelly J. Thompson, “More than a Name: A Content Analysis of Name Authority Records for Authors Who Self-Identify as Trans,” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 60, no. 3 (2016), <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/lrts/article/view/6036/7732> (accessed January 22, 2018); Paromitas Biswas, “Rooted in the Past: Use of ‘East Indians’ in Library of Congress Subject Headings,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1386253>; NISO Webinar, “Can There be Neutrality in Cataloging: A Conversation Starter,” Wednesday, April 11, 2018; ALCTS CaMMS Forum, “Cooperatively Conscientious Cataloging,” ALA Midwinter, Denver, Colorado, February 11, 2018.

Weltanschauung embodied by nineteenth century western imperial adventures and contemporary domestic structures of social oppression.

In 1971, a scant four years after the Six-Day War of 1967, the career-LCSH gadfly Sanford Berman published a manifesto on bias in LCSH that did not include headings that dealt with the Middle East.⁴ In a 1984 article on subject access to Judaica he posits that we should employ Jewish headings in library catalogs that

- specifically and accurately represent or denote Jewish subjects;
- don't bias the library patron against either the materials or the topics;
- reflect the language, experience, and viewpoint of Jews, not Gentiles. of *victims*, not victimizers.

In his effort to inculcate “access and equity” to Jewish library resources, he called upon LCSH to authorize the headings “Israeli-Occupied Territories” “Palestinian State” and “West Bank (Jordan River)--Israeli Settlements” and noted that “Jewish-Arab Relations” is misleading when applied to materials that grapple with “Israeli-Arab Relations”.⁵ Of his recommendations, the heading “Israel-Arab War, 1967--Occupied territories” was established by LCSH in 1986. The closest approximation to Berman's “Palestinian State” are “Palestine” (LCSH 1986) and “Palestinian National Authority” (LCNAF 1995), while LCSH's best match with “West Bank (Jordan River)--Israeli Settlements” is the insipid “Land Settlement--Palestine--History--20th

⁴ Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971).

⁵ Sanford Berman, “Beyond the Pale: Subject Access to Judaica,” *Technical Services Quarterly* 2, nos. 1-2 (1985): 173-89, https://doi.org/10.1300/J124v02n01_12.

century.”⁶ “Jewish-Arab Relations” persists in LCSH despite Berman’s objections, with the more topical heading option of “Israeli-Arab Conflict” (1987).⁷

Other studies and web resources critical of LCSH have noted its bias in covering the realities of the current Middle East, though the author is unaware of systematic treatments of LCSH headings that canvass the geography of the Southern Levant. Eliezer Chammou, for instance, argues cogently that the term “Near East” used by LCSH as a blanket term for the entire region in 1986 was out of sync with contemporary scholarly usage and other subject vocabularies. LCSH deprecated “Near East” in favor of “Middle East” that same year.⁸ Bella Hass Weinberg is most exercised at the treatment of the modern State of Israel as a Narrower Term (NT) to Palestine. That particular NT relationship was changed to a simple Related Term (RT) in LCSH

⁶ LCSH and LCNAF, “Israel-Arab War, 1967--Occupied territories,” “Palestine,” “Palestinian National Authority,” “Land Settlement--Palestine--History--20th century,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85068720>, <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85097163>, <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/no95043722>, <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh2009128594>, respectively, (accessed March 23, 2018).

⁷ LCSH, “Israeli-Arab Conflict,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh87002535> (accessed March 23, 2018).

⁸ Eliezer Chammou, “Near or Middle East? Choice of Name,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1987): 105-120, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v07n03_08.

20th ed. (1997).⁹ In contrast, a post by Radical Reference Blog takes exception to the LCSH heading “Jewish-Arab relations” because it is perceived to conflate “the identities of Jews with Israelis and Zionists.”¹⁰

In a 2015 survey study, nine Middle East studies librarians responded to the question “What do you think are the three main challenges Middle East Librarianship currently faces?” with having to cope with “inadequate subject indexing systems.”¹¹ Edward A. Jajko, a member of MELA (Middle East Librarians Association), takes issue with the difficulty of locating Arab Palestine and the Palestinian Arabs in Library of Congress Classification (LCC) range DS101-151, ISRAEL (PALESTINE)--THE JEWS.

While there are a couple of numbers within this area, DS119.7-119.75, that accommodate some of these materials, the thrust of DS101-151 is the history of the Jews. DS101-151

⁹ Bella Hass Weinberg, “The Hidden Classification in Library of Congress Subject Headings for Judaica,” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 37, no. 4 (1993): 377.

¹⁰ Radical Reference Blog, “Problems with the Cataloging of the Graphic Novel ‘Palestine’ and Zionist Narratives,” October 5, 2008, <https://radicalreference.info/node/2412> (accessed March 7, 2018).

¹¹ Anaïs Salamon, “Middle Eastern Studies Librarians: An Ambivalent Professional Identity,” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41, no. 5 (2015): 650, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.06.009>.

otherwise does not work for materials dealing purely with the Palestinians. Art imitating life, the Palestinians and the Jews just don't fit in the same area.¹²

The Arabic language cataloger at Birzeit University, located north of Ramallah in the West Bank, noted that LCSH does not contain the terms that Palestinians would choose to describe their history, geography or culture. Birzeit librarians successfully petitioned LoC to create a call number for the First Intifada, DS128.4.¹³

In skilled hands, LCSH, like any other value vocabulary, can encode real world geopolitical affirmations that amplify or nullify the biases of the individual subject headings. For instance, Michael Dudley recently contrasted the subject headings assigned an article, “Gaza: Resisting Canadian Complicity, Rethinking Solidarity” indexed in the Alternative Press Index and EBSCO's Masterfile Premier. Alternative Press Index assigned the subject headings “canada — foreign policy” “ethnic cleansing” “gaza” “israel — politics” “israel and the palestinians” “israeli-occupied areas” and “palestine.” Masterfile Premier used for the same article the LCSH headings “PALESTINIANS” “TERRORISM” “COUNTERTERRORISM” “WEAPONS systems” “CIVILIANS in war.” Dudley astutely notes that the subject headings “assigned to this article in MasterFILE do not, in fact, adequately summarize the contents; indeed, they actively

¹² Edward A. Jajko, “Cataloging of Middle Eastern Materials (Arabic, Persian, and Turkish),” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 17, nos. 1-2 (1993): 142, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v17n01_09.

¹³ The Birzeit University Libraries, <http://librarianswithpalestine.org/featured-projects-members/academic-libraries/birzeit-university-libraries> (accessed March 8, 2018).

seek to disguise them, by framing the violence described in the article as justified, when the intent of the authors was precisely — and clearly — the opposite.”¹⁴

Librarians are professionally committed to recognizing, and critiquing, the fluid representational nature of authority in their outreach as scholarly communication advocates, educators, and metadata engineers. *ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (2016), for example, maintains that authority is constructed and contextual:

“Information resources reflect their creators’ expertise and credibility, and are evaluated based on the information need and the context in which the information will be used...Experts understand the need to determine the validity of the information created by different authorities and to acknowledge biases that privilege some sources of authority over others, especially in terms of others’ worldviews, gender, sexual orientation, and cultural orientations.”¹⁵

Since 1898, Library of Congress (LoC) in its unenviable role of “cataloger to the world” has exerted a pivotal force in the shaping of scholarly discourses not only for Congress and the American public, but globally. It is hardly surprising that the mediation of such prodigiously structured knowledge both mirrors and authenticates the official worldview of the librarians who

¹⁴Michael Dudley, “Colonizing Subject Headings,” *The Decolonized Librarian*, November 7, 2014, <https://decolonizedlibrarian.wordpress.com/2014/11/07/colonizing-subject-headings/> (accessed October 19, 2017). Current LCSH “Palestinians” and “Counterterrorism” are Used For (UF) terms for “Palestinian Arabs” and “Terrorism--Prevention”, respectively.

¹⁵ ACRL, “Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education,” <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework> (accessed March 3, 2018).

maintain LCSH, and that includes the geo-political aspirations of Congress, sitting and past. LoC's mission statement is bluntly to the point: "The Library of Congress's mission is to support Congress in fulfilling its constitutional duties, and to further the progress of knowledge and creativity for the benefit of the American people."¹⁶ The Congressional Research Service (CRS) branch of LoC provides "policy and legal analysis to committees and Members of both the House and Senate, regardless of party affiliation...CRS has been a valued and respected resource on Capitol Hill for more than a century."¹⁷ For fiscal year 2018 Congress allocated \$670 million to LoC, an increase of \$38 million from the previous budget, an affirmative nod as it were issued from paymaster to client.¹⁸ Congressional displeasure with LoC has also been in the news as of late. Following a two-year campaign begun by a nonpartisan Dartmouth student group and Dartmouth librarians, with the assistance of the American Library Association, LoC announced it was reviewing the "illegal aliens" subject heading with the aim of replacing it with "unauthorized immigrants". On June 10, 2016, the Republican-controlled U.S. House of Representatives voted 237-170 to order LoC to continue using the term "illegal alien" so as to

¹⁶ LoC, "Legal," <https://www.loc.gov/legal/> (accessed March 3, 2018).

¹⁷ LoC, "Congressional Research Service Careers," <https://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/> (accessed April 11, 2018). CRS.gov, located behind a firewall inaccessible to the American public, reportedly received 1,742,258 views in 2016; "CRS Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2016," https://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/about/crs16_annrpt.pdf (accessed April 12, 2018).

¹⁸ The National Coalition for History: Latest News, "Congress Finally Passes FY 2018 Budget," <http://historycoalition.org/2018/03/23/congress-finally-passes-fy-2018-federal-budget/> (accessed May 5, 2018).

duplicate the language of federal laws written by Congress. This is the first documented instance that Congress has exercised direct legislative veto over LCSH. As of the publication of the 39th ed. of LCSH (2017), “illegal aliens” remains a valid subject heading.¹⁹

Political geography of the Southern Levant

As part of the strategy to end the 1948 Arab-Israeli War in the former Mandatory Palestine, armistice agreements were signed in 1949 between Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. The borders established, sometimes referred to as the Rhodes Armistice Demarcation Line or “Green Line,” held until the June 1967 Six-Day War, when Israel occupied the Syrian territory known as the Golan Heights, the Egyptian sovereign territory Sinai Peninsula and the Egyptian administered region known as the Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem, and the portion of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan known as Transjordan or the West Bank.²⁰ [CAPTION: Israel. INSERT ILLUSTRATION 1/Israel.tif HERE]²¹ On December 14, 1981, Israel effectively annexed the

¹⁹ See Lisa Peet, “LC Drops ‘Illegal Alien’ Subject Heading: Decision Provokes Backlash Legislation,” *Library Journal* 141, no. 11 (2016): 12, <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2016/06/legislation/library-of-congress-drops-illegal-alien-subject-heading-provokes-backlash-legislation/> (accessed March 28, 2018).

²⁰ Benny Morris, *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 375-91; Ahron Bregman, *Israel’s Wars: A History Since 1947* (4th ed.; Warfare and History; London: Routledge, 2016), 67-97.

²¹ Image credits: “Israel”, United Nations Geospatial Information Section, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Map no. 3584 revision 2, January 2004,

occupied Golan Heights through the passage of the Golan Heights Law which extended the administrative authority and laws of the Northern District of the State of Israel over the newly created Subdistrict of the Golan Heights.²² Following the treaty signed by Egypt and Israel in 1979, the territory of the Sinai Peninsula was returned to full Egyptian sovereignty April 1982. The Israeli Military Governorate that originally controlled the Western Golan Heights, Sinai and Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem and West Bank was dissolved in 1982, but Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem and the West Bank remain under Israeli military control.²³ “Palestine” a geographic designation and ethnonym with linguistic roots in the Bronze Age, was used for British-administered

<http://www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/israel.pdf> (accessed and downloaded March 18, 2018). This unaltered map file is declared to be in the public domain.

²² Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Golan Heights Law,”

<http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/peace/guide/pages/golan%20heights%20law.aspx> (accessed March 17, 2018); U.N. Security Council Resolution 497, passed December 17, 1981, declared that Israel’s decision to impose its “laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights” was illegal in the eyes of the international community, <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/418/84/IMG/NR041884.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed March 17, 2018).

²³ Ariella Azoulay and Adi Ophir, *The One-State Condition: Occupation and Democracy in Israel/Palestine* (translated by Tal Haran; Stanford Studies in Middle Eastern and Islamic Societies and Cultures; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 25-123; Lisa Hajjar, *Courting Conflict: The Israeli Military Court System in the West Bank and Gaza* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 253-58.

Mandatory Palestine (1920-48), a territory that covered what is today the State of Israel, Gaza Strip, Jerusalem and West Bank, but did not encompass the Golan Heights or the Sinai Peninsula.²⁴ The term “Southern Levant” has no political jurisdiction or legal force, but can include the territories covered by the Sinai Peninsula and Golan Heights, in addition to that of Mandatory Palestine, hence the title of this paper.

Legal status of the Southern Levant

Beginning with the U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, adopted unanimously by the Security Council in November 1967 hard on the heels of the Six-Day War, the International Court of Justice, the U.N. General Assembly, and the U.N. Security Council have repeatedly classed Israel as an occupying power in contravention to international law as specified by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the Fourth Geneva Convention.²⁵ The Israeli government has contested the legal use of “occupied territories” preferring “administered territories/areas” or

²⁴ Naomi Shepherd, *Ploughing Sand: British Rule in Palestine, 1917-1948* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2000), *passim*.

²⁵ Adam Roberts, “Prolonged Military Occupation: The Israeli-Occupied Territories Since 1967,” *American Journal of International Law* 84, no. 1 (1990): 69-88, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2203016>; Esther Rosalind Cohen, *International Criticism of Israeli Security Measures in the Occupied Territories* (Jerusalem Papers on Peace Problems, 37; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984), 1-44; Jeremy Hammond, “Rogue State: Israeli Violations of U.N. Security Council Resolutions,” *Foreign Policy Journal Blog*, January 27, 2010, <https://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2010/01/27/rogue-state-israeli-violations-of-u-n-security-council-resolutions/0/> (accessed March 10, 2018).

“disputed territories” on the basis of a rejection of the *de jure* applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention, since Israel does not recognize that the territories of the Gaza Strip, West Bank and East Jerusalem formally belonged to a High Contracting Party in 1967.²⁶ Although the Israeli government continues to argue against the nomenclature and legal reality of “occupied Palestinian territories” it remains the position of the U.N. Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the U.N. General Assembly, and the International Committee of the Red Cross, and it is the position of this paper.²⁷

²⁶ Roberts, “Prolonged Military Occupation,” 62-66; Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “153 Address by Prime Minister Rabin before a joint session of the US Congress- 28 January 1976,” <http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MFADocuments/Yearbook2/Pages/153%20Address%20by%20Prime%20Minister%20Rabin%20before%20a%20joint.aspx> (accessed March 2, 2018); “DISPUTED TERRITORIES- Forgotten Facts About the West Bank and Gaza Strip,” 01 February 2003, <http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFA-Archive/2003/Pages/DISPUTED%20TERRITORIES-%20Forgotten%20Facts%20About%20the%20We.aspx> (accessed March 2, 2018); “Israel, the Conflict and Peace: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions,” 30 December 2009, http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/issues/pages/faq_peace_process_with_palestinians_dec_2009.aspx#Settlements1 (accessed March 2, 2018).

²⁷ See Harvard Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, *Review of the Applicability of International Humanitarian Law to the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, Policy Brief 2004, <https://web.stanford.edu/group/scai/images/harvardreview.pdf> (accessed March 2, 2018).

LCSH geographic headings for the Southern Levant

Gaza Strip

In 1970 “Gaza Strip” was assigned the MARC Geographic Areas Code (GAC) “awgz” and the MARC Countries Code “gz.” “Gaza Strip” with no further qualification, first appeared in LCSH 10th (1986).²⁸ LCSH 11th ed. (1988) established its use as a direct geographic subdivision, and “Palestine” as a Broader Term (BT) relationship, both of which continue in use today. The LCSH authority record for Gaza Strip does not have a 043 with a MARC GAC, but does incorporate a 034 with NGA GEOnet latitude and longitude coordinates. There are no overtly political citations in the 670 source citation notes, although two of them classify the place as “territory,” suggesting, by silence, that there is nothing out of the ordinary about the “territory” and the 1.85 million Palestinians who live in Gaza Strip.²⁹

Golan Heights

“Golan Heights” was assigned the MARC GAC “a-sy” [Syria], year unknown. “Golan Heights” with Used For (UF) entries but no further qualification, first appeared in LCSH 10th ed. (1986). Echoing the treatment of Gaza Strip, LCSH 11th ed. (1988) established its use as a direct geographic subdivision, and “Palestine” as a BT relationship. Among the UF terms, the 1988 11th ed. bravely ventured “Syria (Territory under Israeli occupation, 1967-),” a graphically

²⁸ LCSH, “Gaza Strip,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85053589> (accessed February 2, 2018). Access to LCSH editions earlier than 35th (2013) was provided by HathiTrust. LCSH URIs, unless otherwise noted, are from LC Linked Data Service website.

²⁹ LCSH, “Gaza Strip,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85053589> (accessed February 2, 2018).

descriptive UF that persisted for a decade in LCSH until it was removed from the 22nd ed. (1999). In 2006 LCSH 29th ed. removed “BT Palestine” from the Golan Heights entry, effectively severing the heading from any country in the region. In 34th ed. (2012), two Antiquities Narrower Term (NT) relationships were established, ‘En Nashut Site (Golan Heights) and Khirbet Dikke Site (Golan Heights). The current LCSH authority record has no MARC 034, 043 or 551 field entries, and no 670s, thus maintaining the abstraction of “Golan Heights” from the political landscape of the Southern Levant.³⁰ LCC, however, locates Golan Heights in Syria (DS 99.G65: “Syria. Provinces, regions, cities, etc. Golan Heights. Jawlan”).

Israel

In 1970 MARC GAC tagged Israel as “a-is,” MARC Countries Code “is.” “Israel” already appears in LCSH 8th ed. (1975), the earliest edition consulted for this study. It has no BT/NT relationships or antiquities subheadings. “Palestine” as a BT relationship first appears in 11th ed. (1988). The BT “Palestine” was removed from “Israel” in 20th ed. (1997) and remains absent through the 39th ed. (2017). The LCSH/LCNAF authority record has GeoNames and Klokantech Technologies Bounding Box coordinates in multiple 034s, a 043 with a MARC GAC, an extremely long list of variant names, eight 670s, a simple Related Term (RT) with “Palestine” and a 781 with only “Israel.” The current authority record in effect asserts a relationship exists between Palestine and Israel, but provides no clue as to details. The only political information in

³⁰ LCSH, “Golan Heights,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85055691> (accessed February 3, 2018).

the record is a 670 citing *The Stateman's Year-Book, 1995-1996*, "Israel; Medinat Israel (State of Israel); proclaimed as state: 14 May 1948."³¹

Jerusalem

MARC GAC identifies "Jerusalem" as both Israel and West Bank (a-is, awba). "Jerusalem" appears in LCSH 8th ed. (1975) with no BT/NT relationships or antiquities subheadings. In the 10th ed. (1986) "Jerusalem" is to be used directly as a subheading, instructions that were removed from the 20th ed. (1997) but have been adhered to nonetheless in subsequent editions. "Ketef Hinnom Site (Israel)" as an "Israel--Antiquities" NT first appears in 16th ed. (1993), to be corrected in the following edition (17th, 1994) to "Ketef Hinnom Site (Jerusalem)". LCSH established "Ketef Hinnom Site (Jerusalem)" with BT Jerusalem in 1992 (sh 92003299), so the 16th ed. entry under Israel was probably a typo. The LCSH/LCNAF authority record lists multiple 034s, a 043 with the two MARC GACs, a 370 "associated place" entry with two "associated countries," Israel and Palestine, a sizable number of variant name forms, and no RT/BT/NTs. Some of the 670s do describe the political status of Jerusalem in terms of its lack of international and U.S. (as of 2015) recognition as the capital of Israel.³²

Palestine

MARC GAC currently identifies "Palestine" as Israel, West Bank and Gaza Strip (a-is, awba, awgz). "Palestine" appears in LCSH 8th ed. (1975) with no BT/NT relationships or antiquities

³¹ LCNAF, "Israel," <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n79003285> (accessed February 3, 2018).

³² LCNAF, "Jerusalem," <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n81126877> (accessed February 3, 2018).

subheadings. In the 11th ed. (1988), usage of Palestine headings is specified in a 680 General Note as

Here are entered works on the region of the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea that in ancient times was called the Land of Canaan, later the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and in modern times comprises the entire state of Israel, as well as the various disputed territories. Works on a specific jurisdiction or territory within the region are entered under its respective name (vol. 3 p. 2741).

Use of biblical geographic nomenclature to frame its scope of usage instead of a reference to Ottoman or British Mandatory territorial designations abstracts the discourse from the politically troubled present to the timeless pieties of the Judeo-Christian sacred canon. NT relationships in the 11th ed. included Gaza Strip, Golan Heights, Israel, and West Bank. In 21st ed. (1997) the reciprocal BT/NT relationship between “Israel” and “Palestine” was dropped altogether. By the 29th ed. (2006), “Golan Heights” no longer has a NT relationship with “Palestine.” The current LCSH authority record has no 034, no 043, sports a single variant name, “Holy Land,” no RT/BT/NT relationships, no 670 source citations, but retains the same 680 introduced in the 11th ed. (1988), with the language of “disputed territories” which are otherwise undefined. In comparison with the LCSH/LCNAF authority record for “Israel,” the brevity of the record, with no Arabic variant names or source citations, is striking.³³

West Bank

³³ LCSH, “Palestine,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85097163> (accessed February 3, 2018).

MARC GAC currently identifies West Bank as “awba.” Interestingly, a GAC record history note reveals that “West Bank” was coded “a-is” (Israel) and/or “a-jo” (Jordan) prior to March 1988.³⁴ “West Bank” first appears in LCSH 10th ed. (1986), with a string of UF headings that include Palestinian Arabic and Israeli designations for the assigned occupation jurisdictions (Ḍaffah al-Gharbīyah / Gadah ha-ma‘aravit / Judaea and Samaria / Judea and Samaria / West Bank of the Jordan River / Yehuda yeha-Shomron). Like the heading Jerusalem, instructions for use as a geographic subheading is direct. In LCSH 11th ed. (1988), “West Bank” was defined with a BT relationship to “Palestine” which is retained in all subsequent LCSH editions. The current LCSH authority record has neither 034 nor 043, uses the same list of variant names established in the 11th ed., has a single relationship 551, a BT with Palestine, and no 670 source citations.³⁵ LCSH “West Bank” subject heading authority record effectively has nothing to do with Israel, Jordan, or any other territory in the Southern Levant except Palestine. Judging from the rejected changes to LCSH in *LoC Cataloging Service Bulletins (CSB)*, LoC has been conflicted for years over adding “West Bank” as a geographic qualifier to several locations/entities within the territory:

³⁴ MARC GAC, “West Bank,” <http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/geographicAreas/awba> (accessed February 3, 2018). *LoC Cataloging Service Bulletin* no. 41, Summer 1988 provides instructions for creating headings for territories under Israeli occupation, using neutral language.

³⁵ LCSH, “West Bank,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85146164> (accessed February 3, 2018).

Herodium, the Duyhashah Refugee Camp, Qumran, Samaria Region, Belmont Castle Site (Jerusalem), Mount Scopus, and the illegal Israeli settlement Ezyon Bloc.³⁶

Sinai Peninsula

Current MARC GAC for “Sinai (Egypt)” is “f-ua” (Egypt). “Sinai” is not a geographical heading in LCSH, but first appeared in LCNAF as “Sinai” (n50069570), later changed to “Sinai (Egypt)” (n86034525), with variant forms Sīnā’ (Egypt), Sinai Peninsula (Egypt), Sinaitic Peninsula (Egypt), Shibh Jazīrat Sīnā’ (Egypt). A 670 source citation entry notes that the Sinai Peninsula was returned to Egypt April 25, 1982; from whom is not mentioned. Sinai (Egypt) was divided into two provinces by Egyptian decree in 1979: Janūb Sīnā’ (Egypt) and Shamāl Sīnā’ (Egypt), both of which have LCNARs. It is unknown whether LCNAF “Sinai”/“Sinai (Egypt)” had a UF “Egypt (Territory under Israeli occupation, 1967-)” analogous to the UF “Syria (Territory under Israeli occupation, 1967-)” included between 1988 and 1999 in the LCSH subject heading “Golan Heights.”

The core 2013 Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements instructions for creating headings for Israel, Jordan and Syria were actually codified in LoC *CSB* no. 41 (1988): “Do not add the name of the country to places that prior to 1967 were in Jordan or

³⁶ Herodium: LoC *CSB* no. 73, 1996; Duyhashah Refugee Camp: LoC *CSB* no. 75, 1997; Qumran: LoC *CSB* no. 80, 1998; Samaria Region: LoC *CSB* no. 90, 2000; Belmont Castle Site (Jerusalem): LoC *CSB* no. 98, 2002; Mount Scopus: LoC *CSB* no. 126, 2010; and Ezyon Bloc: LoC *CSB* no. 114, 2007. “Herodium,” for instance, first appears in LCSH 10th ed. (1986), but is not qualified as “Herodium (West Bank)” until the 20th ed. (1997). “Qumran Site” became “Qumran Site (West Bank)” in LCSH 21st ed. (1998).

Syria and that are currently within the administered territories of Israel. For Jerusalem, use ‘Jerusalem’.”³⁷ *LC Subject Headings Manual* H 0980, “Jerusalem, Gaza Strip, Golan Heights, West Bank, and Palestine,” (June 2013) reiterates this, with further instructions on using these terms as geographic subdivisions in compound headings and for subject headings for entities within these territories. Although features like rivers/wadis that flow between Green-Line Israel and Gaza Strip or the West Bank are not to be qualified (example: Besor River, *not* Besor River (Gaza Strip and Israel)), the topical heading can be identified with multiple territories in the 550 broader terms. “Palestine” as a subject heading is used of works that “in modern times comprises the entire state of Israel, as well as the various disputed territories” but is not to be used for works dealing specifically with Gaza Strip or the West Bank. “Palestinian National Authority” established in LCNAF, is tagged 151 but “represents a governmental entity, not a geographic area.” The MARC geographic area codes for these territories are

Gaza Strip = awgz

Golan Heights = a-sy [Syria]

Jerusalem = a-is and/or awba “as appropriate”

Palestine = a-is, awgz, awba

West Bank = awba.³⁸

³⁷ LoC *CSB*, No. 41, Summer 1988, https://www.loc.gov/cds/PDFdownloads/csb/CSB_041.pdf, and RDA Toolkit 16.2.2.12 (accessed January 27, 2018).

³⁸ *LC Subject Headings Manual* H 0980, “Jerusalem, Gaza Strip, Golan Heights, West Bank, and Palestine” (June 2013), <https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeSHM/H0980.pdf> (accessed

Application of Southern Levant headings in LoC cataloging

An advanced search of LoC public catalog for subject geographic terms yielded, for Israel, over 10,000 hits; for Palestine over 10,000 hits; for Jerusalem, 9,629 hits; for West Bank, 3,636 hits; for Gaza Strip, 2,546 hits; for Sinai, 914 hits; and for Golan Heights, 196 hits. Despite the political anemia of LCSH geographic headings for the Southern Levant, LoC cataloging, copy and original, often displays an effort to provide a more nuanced perspective that is closer to that of the global community. For example, LCSH “Israel-Arab War, 1967” includes the subdivisions “Jerusalem” “Syria” “Egypt” “Campaigns--West Bank” “Campaigns--Golan Heights” “Campaigns--Israel” “Campaigns--Egypt” “Campaigns--Syria” “Occupied territories” and “Territorial questions.” LoC catalog has used the heading “Israel-Arab War, 1967”, with and without subdivisions, 1,177 times. The general subdivision “Occupied territories” only figures in three complex LCSH headings: “Israel-Arab War, 1967--Occupied territories” (277 hits) “Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1905--Occupied territories” (4 hits) and “World War, 1939-1945--Occupied territories” (298 hits) all established in 1986. 146 works have been cataloged with “Israel” and “Occupied territories” in the subject headings. English language Israeli governmental publications prefer the term “administered territories” or “administered areas” in titles (22 hits) over “occupied” (0) or “disputed” (0), but the independently-minded LoC catalog has assigned the LCSH subheading “Occupied territories” to 18 of these works. “Palestinian Arabs--Israel”

January 27, 2018). LCNAF “Palestinian National Authority” =

<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/no95043722> (accessed March 28, 2018).

heading established in 1986, is used 1,980 times in LoC catalog, with or without subdivisions.³⁹ “Land settlement--Government policy--Israel” published in 2009, is used 68 times in LoC catalog, with and without subdivisions.⁴⁰ “Segregation--Palestine” is not an established LCSH heading, but it was used once in LoC catalog for Virginia Tilley (ed.), *Beyond Occupation: Apartheid, Colonialism and International Law in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*.⁴¹ LCSH heading “Occupied territories” has a 681 note “reference under the heading military occupation” but no variant or related terms.⁴² “Military occupation” has the variants “Belligerent occupation” and “Occupied territory” and the related terms “Conquest, Right of” and “Military government.” The subject headings “Military occupation” and “Israel” “Gaza Strip” “West Bank” “Palestine” “Jerusalem” and “Golan Heights” are collocated 50, 27, 57, 3, 2, and 1 times, respectively, in LoC catalog. “Human rights--Israel” “Human rights--Gaza Strip” and “Human rights--West Bank” occur in LoC catalog 229, 148, and 205 times, respectively. “Political violence--Israel” “Political violence--Palestine” “Political violence--West Bank” “Political violence--Gaza Strip” are not established complex headings in LCSH, but they occur 41, 8, 12 and 13 times, respectively, in LoC catalog. “Arab-Israeli Conflict” with chronological, topical and form

³⁹ Library of Congress Online Catalog searches performed between January 27 and March 22, 2018.

⁴⁰ LCSH, “Land settlement--Government policy--Israel,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh2009128590> (accessed January 27, 2018).

⁴¹ LCC KMK2095.B49 2012.

⁴² LCSH, “Occupied territories,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh00006864> (accessed January 27, 2018).

subheadings, garners 3,240 hits in LoC catalog.⁴³ By deploying these topical subject headings, LoC subject analysis stands more closely aligned with global opinion about the Southern Levant than the LCSH geographic headings, taken in isolation, might suggest.

LCSH has paid increasing attention to refining and augmenting headings related to the Southern Levant from the 11th edition forward, 1988-, a date that includes the LoC *CSB* that established explicit rules for handling these headings. The historical context for this ramp-up could be the First Intifada (December 1987-1993) and the intense bipartisan engagement of Congress and the American public in the negotiations between the Palestine Liberation Organization factions, the Israeli government, and the U.S. State Department. One index of the shuttle diplomacy acceleration: George P. Schultz, Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan (1982-89) made one extended visit to the region in the four years leading up to the Intifada, but three trips in the half year following the beginning of the coordinated Palestinian resistance. The domestic media was saturated with interviews by Congressional committee leaders, State Department officials, and pundits debating progress made towards “land for peace” dialogue held, for the first time, between the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel’s fragile National Unity government.⁴⁴

⁴³ Library of Congress Online Catalog searches performed between January 27 and March 22, 2018.

⁴⁴ See David Pollock, “The American Response to the Intifada,” in Robert O. Freedman (ed.), *The Intifada: Its Impact on Israel, the Arab World, and the Superpowers* (Miami: Florida International University Press, 1991), 109-35; George E. Gruen, “Impact of the Intifada on American Jews and the Reaction of the American Public and of Israeli Jews,” in Freedman (ed.), *Intifada*, 220-66.

At least three volumes devoted to the Intifada were published in 1990, with CIP requirements driving the establishment of descriptive headings.⁴⁵ LCSH did indeed establish headings for the First Intifada in 1990, a scant two years into the event, breakneck speed compared to other current events that took far longer to filter into the subject headings canon.⁴⁶

Comparison with other national library authority records and independent value vocabularies

Répertoire d'autorité-matière encyclopédique et alphabétique unifié (RAMEAU)

The authority records maintained by the Bibliothèque nationale de France establish the headings “Gaza, Bande de (Palestine)” “Golan (plateau)” “Israël” “Cisjordanie (Palestine)” and “Palestine (État).” The scope notes use the language of annexation and occupation. For example, the note for Golan (plateau) reads “Plateau syrien occupé par Israël en juin 1967, annexé le 14 déc. 1981; cette annexion n’est pas reconnue par la communauté internationale.”⁴⁷

⁴⁵ From the stacks of James Madison University Libraries: Don Peretz, *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising* (London; Boulder; San Francisco: Westview Press, 1990); Ze’ev Schiff and Ehud Ya’ari (eds.), *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising: Israel’s Third Front* (translated by Ina Friedman; New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990); Phyllis Bennis, *From Stones to Statehood: The Palestinian Uprising* (photographs by Neal Cassidy; Brooklyn, N.Y.: Olive Branch Press, 1990).

⁴⁶ “Gaza Strip--Palestinian Uprising, 1987-” and “West Bank--Palestinian Uprising, 1987-” (LCSH 13th ed. 1990-14th ed. 1991); “Intifada, 1987-” (LCSH 15th, 1992-30th ed. 2007); “Intifada, 1987-1993” (LCSH 31st ed. 2009-).

⁴⁷ BnF Catalogue général, “Golan (plateau),” <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11973678m>; “Gaza, Bande de (Palestine),” <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11974076h>; “Israël,”

Gemeinsame Normdatei (GND)

Since 2012, GND has served as the primary common authority file for the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB). GND has established the headings “Gazastreifen” “Golanhöhen” “Israel” “Westjordanland” and “Palästina.” Before we describe these records, the reader should be cognizant of the historical and legal dilemma that the DNB faced by defining headings related to the State of Israel that could be construed as critical of its military occupation/annexation, and favorable to the State of Palestine or Palestinians. I refer to the systemic and genocidal anti-Semitism of the Third Reich and the federal laws that the Bundesrepublik Deutschland has enacted to punish use of Nazi symbolism, Holocaust denial and hate speech related to anti-Semitism. See §130.3-4 of the German Penal Code (1985), strengthened in 1994.⁴⁸ Criticism of the State of Israel in Germany is inevitably controversial.⁴⁹ The GND scope notes, when they exist, posit nothing about the post-1948 military history or United Nations rulings. The ISO 3166 codes for all of the headings, save for Golanhöhen, is XB-IL; Golanhöhen is XB-IL and XB-SY.

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb11934249b>; “Cisjordanie (Palestine),”

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb119512898>; “Palestine (État),”

<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb13507488g> (all accessed January 31, 2018).

⁴⁸ Bundesministerium der Justiz und für Verbraucherschutz, “Strafgesetzbuch,”

https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stgb/___130.html (accessed March 28, 2018).

⁴⁹ See the 2014 opinion piece in Deutsche Welle, “Criticism of Israel or anti-Semitism?”

<http://www.dw.com/en/criticism-of-israel-or-anti-semitism/a-17807132> (accessed February 2, 2018).

Unlike LCSH today, however, GND maintains “Palästina” as a BT relationship for Israel, along with NT Gaza Strip, Golan Heights and the West Bank.⁵⁰

Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (TGN)

TGN, an open access database curated by the privately owned Getty Research Institute, published under a copyright held by The J. Paul Getty Trust, adds the political status to the “authorized access points.” “Gaza Strip (occupied territory)” note uses the language of “seized from Egypt” and “Israeli-occupied” and lists two hierarchical parents: “Israel (nation)” and “State of Palestine (autonomous area).”⁵¹ “Golan Heights (annex)” bears a crisp note “Hilly region in NW Syria; annexed by Israel in 1981; main occupants are Syrian Druze & Sunnis, Palestinian refugees & Jewish settlers” and also lists two parents: “Syria (nation)/Al Qunaytirah (governorate)” and “Israel (nation).”⁵² “West Bank (occupied territory)” describes the political history of the region since 1949 and lists the same two parents as Gaza Strip.⁵³ “Israel (nation)”

⁵⁰ GND, “Gazastreifen,” <http://d-nb.info/gnd/4019325-1>; “Golanhöhen,” <http://d-nb.info/gnd/4238285-3>; “Israel,” <http://d-nb.info/gnd/4027808-6>; “Westjordanland,” <http://d-nb.info/gnd/4065741-3>; and “Palästina,” <http://d-nb.info/gnd/4044381-4> (all accessed January 31, 2018).

⁵¹ TGN, “Gaza Strip (occupied territory),” <http://vocab.getty.edu/page/tgn/7001390> (accessed January 31, 2018).

⁵² TGN “Golan Heights (annex),” <http://vocab.getty.edu/page/tgn/7002267> (accessed January 31, 2018).

⁵³ TGN, “West Bank (occupied territory),” <http://vocab.getty.edu/page/tgn/7016849> (accessed January 31, 2018).

“established with partition of Palestine between Arabs & Jews, May 15, 1948” is assigned the political status of primary political unit, independent sovereign nation and republic.⁵⁴ “State of Palestine (autonomous area)” is assigned the political status of primary political unit, state, and disputed territory. The note for State of Palestine deals explicitly with United Nations votes and resolutions regarding its status in the global community.⁵⁵

GeoNames

GeoNames, a Wikipedia-like project with over eleven million place-names, labels all entities within the borders of Gaza Strip and West Bank as “Palestine” but uses “Israel” for the territory recognized as Israel within the Rhodes Armistice Demarcation Line, 1949, and “Egypt” (North and South Sinai governorates) as the Sinai Peninsula territory returned to Egypt in April 1982.⁵⁶ GeoNames codes “Golan Heights” as a “region” and identifies it as having the first-order administrative division name of Syria.⁵⁷

The stark contrast between the treatment of the Southern Levant in the two national authority files, and the privately- and publically-maintained vocabularies, is illustrative of the historical

⁵⁴ TGN, “Israel (nation),” <http://vocab.getty.edu/page/tgn/1000119> (accessed January 31, 2018).

⁵⁵ TGN, “State of Palestine (autonomous area),” <http://vocab.getty.edu/page/tgn/7018359> (accessed January 31, 2018).

⁵⁶ GeoNames, “Palestine,” <http://www.geonames.org/6254930/palestine>; “State of Israel,” <http://www.geonames.org/294640/state-of-israel>; “Arab Republic of Egypt,” <http://www.geonames.org/357994/arab-republic-of-egypt> (accessed March 28, 2018).

⁵⁷ GeoNames, “Golan Heights,” <http://www.geonames.org/173708/golan-heights> (accessed March 28, 2018).

pushes and pulls experienced by LoC's custodianship of LCSH, the looming threat of Congressional interference, and the opinion shared by most of the global community regarding the political and legal status of the regional entities.

Pro-Israel politics and Congress

American fascination with Palestine long predates the founding of the republic. Self-identification of the Puritan colonists of what would become New England in a biblically-inspired vision of the Holy Land was voiced even during the Atlantic crossing. For example, John Winthrop, the first governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, wrote in 1630 while at sea "For wee must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill," a messianic association based on Matthew 5:14.⁵⁸ American nineteenth-century Holy Land geo-piety encountered success in the guise of popular "on-the-spot" paintings, photographs and the rise of the biblical archaeology movement, but failure in efforts to form sectarian colonies in Ottoman Palestine or to induce the Sublime Porte to create a Jewish homeland there, despite the installation of an American Consulate in Jerusalem in 1844.⁵⁹ Congressional efforts to translate American political policy into support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine took the form of a joint resolution passed September 21, 1922, the same day that the League of Nations approved the creation of

⁵⁸ John Davis, *The Landscape of Belief: Encountering the Holy Land in Nineteenth-Century American Art and Culture* (Princeton Series in Nineteenth-Century Art, Culture and Society; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), 15.

⁵⁹ Davis, *Landscape of Belief*, 27-52.

Mandatory Palestine under British administration.⁶⁰ The United States support for the United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine (1947) and recognition of the newly formed State of Israel (1948) was a result of intense advocacy and lobbying on Capital Hill. President Truman later noted sourly that “I do not think I ever had as much pressure and propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance. The persistence of a few of the extreme Zionist leaders—actuated by political motives and engaging in political threats—disturbed and annoyed me.”⁶¹

American military aid to Israel first topped a billion dollars (\$2,482,700) in 1974, following the Yom Kippur War of October 1973, and has not dropped below a combined military and economic package of \$2 billion plus since 1982, the beginning of the Reagan presidency.⁶² The “Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995” (S. 1322, Public Law 104-45) to move the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem was passed by a 95 to 3 vote in the Senate and 374 to 37 vote in the House of Representatives.⁶³ From the election cycles of 1996 to 2016, pro-Israel contributions to federal

⁶⁰ 67th Congress, “Public Resolution no. 73,” <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/u-s-congress-endorses-the-balfour-declaration> (accessed March 18, 2018).

⁶¹ George Lenczowski, *American Presidents and the Middle East* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990), 28.

⁶² Jewish Virtual Library, “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel: Total Aid (1949-Present),” <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/total-u-s-foreign-aid-to-israel-1949-present> (accessed February 17, 2018).

⁶³ Philip Bump, “In 1995, Congress Reached a Compromise on the Issue of Jerusalem. Trump is Poised to End It,” *Washington Post*, December 6, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/12/06/in-1995-congress-reached-a->

elections has seen a steady increase from \$5.5 to \$17.8 million.⁶⁴ According to Govtrack.us website, Congress has introduced 718 bills related to the subject of Israel since the 93rd Congress (1973-74); 364 of those bills have been introduced since 2011.⁶⁵

Congress has not always been in accord with the Israel government's preference for the language of "disputed" or "administered" versus "occupied" territories. For example, ten years after the Six-Day War of 1967, the U.S. Senate released hearings from the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, "The Colonization of the West Bank Territories by Israel," in which "occupied territories" occurs 207 times, with a single instance of "disputed territories."⁶⁶ Times change. Partisanship of the designation of

compromise-on-the-issue-of-jerusalem-trump-is-poised-to-end-it/?utm_term=.e2c37fc9eca4 (accessed February 17, 2018).

⁶⁴ OpenSecrets.org, "Pro-Israel: Totals,"

<https://www.opensecrets.org/industries/totals.php?cycle=2014&ind=Q05> (accessed February 17, 2018).

⁶⁵ GovTrack.us,

https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/subjects/israel/6595?congress=113#sort=-introduced_date&congress=__ALL__ (accessed February 18, 2018).

⁶⁶ U.S. Senate, *The Colonization of the West Bank Territories by Israel, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary*, Ninety-Fifth Congress, First Session on "The Question of the West Bank Settlements and the Treatment of Arabs in the Israeli-Occupied Territories," October 17 and 18, 1977

Palestinian land as “disputed” versus “occupied” territories is patent but by no means remarkable in H.R. 4718: Recognition of Jerusalem as the State of Israel, introduced in the 115th Congress (December 2017):

Sec. 2 Findings (4): On July 31, 1988, Jordan relinquished its disputed sovereignty claims to Judea and Samaria and East Jerusalem, and therefore sovereign claims to these areas remain “disputed”, not “occupied”.⁶⁷

The international movement Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS), modeled on the Anti-Apartheid Movement from the 1960s, attempts to impose economic, cultural and academic boycotts against the State of Israel, in particular companies not under Palestinian control that profit from resource exploitation in the occupied territories.⁶⁸ As of February 2018, 24 USA state legislatures have passed laws penalizing or criminalizing participation in BDS-sponsored boycotts.⁶⁹ There is also federal legislation in reading, “The Israel Anti-Boycott Act” (S. 720 and

(Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), 1-184,

<https://www.loc.gov/law/find/hearings/pdf/00139297647.pdf> (accessed March 2, 2018).

⁶⁷ GovTrack.us, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/hr4718/text> (accessed February 18, 2018).

⁶⁸ BDS, <https://bdsmovement.net/> (accessed March 23, 2018).

⁶⁹ Palestine Legal, “Anti-BDS Legislation by State,” <https://palestinelegal.org/righttoboycott/> (accessed March 23, 2018).

H.R. 1697), introduced in March 2017, that expands on the Export Administration Act of 1979 to prevent U.S. businesses from participating in politically-motivated boycotts of Israel.⁷⁰

One recent study of why American politicians increasingly support pro-Israel policies concludes that public opinion, not the Israel lobby, is the primary motivator.⁷¹ To put this in perspective, Christians United for Israel (CUFI), established in 1992, is the largest pro-Israel organization in the U.S., with a reported enrollment of one million members by 2012, two million members by January 2015, over three million by July 2016, and four million by 2018.⁷² CUFI activism claims

⁷⁰ Congress.gov, “S.720 - Israel Anti-Boycott Act,” <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/720/text>; <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1697/text> (accessed March 23, 2018).

⁷¹ Michael J. Koplow, “Value Judgment: Why Do Americans Support Israel?” *Security Studies* 20, no. 2 (2011): 266-302, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2011.572690>.

⁷² Ari Morgenstern, “Christians United for Israel Crosses Million Member Mark,” *Christians United for Israel Press Release* March 19, 2012, http://cufi.convio.net/site/News2?news_iv_ctrl=-1&page=NewsArticle&id=11449 (accessed February 17, 2018); Sean Savage, “At 3.1 Million Members, CUFI Continues to Promote Israel Support as Core Christian Value,” *Jewish News Syndicate*, July 22, 2016 (<https://www.jns.org/at-3-1-million-members-cufi-continues-to-promote-israel-support-as-core-christian-value/#.V5Z7KVc9Zng>) (accessed February 17, 2018); “CUFI in Action,” *Christians United for Israel* website (<https://www.cufi.org/impact/about-us/cufi-in-action/>) (accessed February 17, 2018). While the author of this piece is suspicious of these numbers, massive grassroots support for CUFI and what it represents exerts a formidable effect on Congressional policy.

responsibility for generating over one million emails to Congress in 2017 in order to pass the Taylor Force Act (H.R. 1164).⁷³

It is not the intention of the author to condemn or applaud the uptick in Congressional engagement with Israel since the 1980s -- the investment is certainly not black and white -- but rather to demonstrate that the funding source for LoC, the U.S. Congress, is massively invested in pro-Israel partisan politics, and that as a consequence the LCSH geographical subject headings that deal with Israeli-occupied territories do not and cannot say anything directly about the *de facto* state of military occupation.

Decolonizing LCSH in the Southern Levant

There are workarounds for libraries wishing to convey information “missing” in LCSH geographical headings for the Southern Levant.

- Use multiple LCSH subject headings that convey the geo-political realities of the Southern Levant

“Israel-Arab War, 1967--Occupied territories” “Arab-Israeli Conflict--Occupied territories” “Military occupation” “Land settlement--Government policy--Israel” and many other headings are available in LCSH that, sagaciously used in combination with the artificially neutral geographical headings, can make resources that deal with the occupied territories both “accessible and equitable” in the words of Sanford Berman. LoC cataloging itself provides many praiseworthy examples.

- Modify LCSH authority records/subject headings for the Southern Levant so as to make public catalog browsing and searching “accessible and equitable”

⁷³ “CUFI in Action.”

The humble library OPAC and “discovery services” capable of negotiating MARC authority records provide more than a functional gateway to library resources: they serve as ambassadors for the real-world entities that RDA cataloging is determined to model.

Libraries running ILS/LSP with authority record indexing can eschew the disingenuous apoliticism of LCSH geographic subject headings for the Southern Levant by changing the authorized access points, UF, BT/NT and display notes. The author has taken LCSH MARC 21 authority records for Golan Heights, Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, West Bank, and Palestine and altered the 151 authorized access points to match the preferred forms in Getty TGN, added pertinent 024s, 034 coordinates when missing, MARC GAC 043s, 451s/551s, 667s, 670s and 680s.⁷⁴ Depending upon the configuration of a library’s OPAC or discovery service, the systems can search the 451s and 551s, and display them as well as the 680 notes.

- Lobby LoC for changes to LCSH

Follow in the footsteps of Sanford Berman and petition LoC to revise these geographical subject headings. In light of the 2016 congressional interference with LoC’s plans to replace LCSH subject heading “illegal aliens” with “unauthorized immigrants,” however, the author holds slender hopes that importuning LoC to update “Golan Heights” “Gaza Strip” “West Bank” “Palestine” and “Jerusalem” subject headings to better reflect global opinion will result in constructive change, given the prevailing winds blowing from Capitol Hill.

⁷⁴ These files are in MARC 21 binary and xml formats and can be downloaded from the author’s GitHub site: https://github.com/Stevenholloway/Marc_Authorities_Southern_Levant. The 680 notes were lifted verbatim from the corresponding Getty TGN records.